REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 14, 15, 17, 19-27, 31, and 33-36 are pending.

Claims 1-7, 14, 15, 17, 19-27, 31, and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Greenberg et al. (US 2001/0038624) (hereinafter "Greenberg"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites:

A method for correlating a user's use of a website with a user's phone call to a customer service agent for a business, where the phone call to the customer service agent is made independent of the website, the method comprising:

for each user that accesses the website, *transmitting a webpage to the user that visibly displays a unique ID, where the unique ID is unique to the user's web browser, and the where the unique ID is generated without obtaining information that identifies the user personally*;

storing a record of the unique IDs that have been displayed to users in a webpage;

in response to a user telephoning a customer service agent for the business *independent of the website*, obtaining the user's unique ID from the user; and

correlating the user's call to the customer service agent with the users' use of the website using the user's unique ID. (Emphasis added).

The present invention enables a user's use of a website to be correlated with a user's subsequent telephone call (made independent of the website) to a customer service agent. Such correlation is useful in tracking the effect of advertising efforts. For example, if a company pays for a link to its website on a search engine site, such as Google or Yahoo, it is desirable for the company to know the percentage of its customers

that used that link to subsequently purchase a product. Such information is relatively easy to track if the customer purchases a product on a company's website after using an advertised link. Such information also is easy to track if the user purchases a product in a phone call made by clicking on a link, button, or other icon on the website. However, prior to the present invention, such information was lost if, after viewing the website, the customer elected to purchase the product through a call made independent of the website. The invention also is useful in helping customer service agents answering customer phone calls to cross-sell products in that the customer service agent can see what products the user viewed on the website.

Greenberg is related to a different technology than the present invention. Greenberg is related to voice-over-IP (VOIP) technology. Specifically, Greenberg enables a phone call to be placed from a personal computer without the need for the computer to have been previously configured for Internet telephony (Paragraph 0011).

Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Greenberg for at least the following reasons:

1. The purpose of the present invention is to correlate a call made independent of an applicable merchant's website[1] with previous use of such website, whereas the method cited by the Examiner in Greenberg pertains to a enabling a user to initiate a call from a merchant's website.

As stated above, Greenberg is directed to enabling a phone call to be placed from a personal computer without the need for the computer to have been previously configured for Internet telephony. In the rejection of claim 1, the Examiner focuses on

[1] In the previous response, Applicant use the term "non-web initiated call." To be clear, this means a call made independent of the merchant's website. It does not preclude independent calls made through VoIP applications, such as Skype.

the method described with respect to Figures 10 and 11. The purpose of this particular method is to enable a user to make an Internet telephony call from his personal computer by clicking on an "icon" on a merchant's website. Because a user clicks on an icon in the merchant's website to make the call, the user initiates the call from the merchant's website, and, therefore Greenberg is not relevant to the present invention. The purpose of the present invention is to correlate a call made independent of a merchant's website with use of such website. As stated above, it is easy to correlate a phone call with use of a website when a user initiates the call through the website by clicking on a link or button. The difficult problem is associating use of a website with a subsequent call made independent of the website, and this is the problem that the claimed invention solves.

In the "Response to Argument" section of the Office Action, the Examiner disagrees that Greenberg fails to teach correlating a user's use of a website with a subsequent call made independent of a website. As support for this position, the Examiner states "Greenberg discloses the customer/session ID is used to identify the customer or the session without actually identifying the customer to the merchant." Even if using a session ID does not identify a customer by name to a merchant, this is not relevant to the issue of whether or not the call is made independent of the website. **Greenberg is clearly directed to enabling a user to initiate a call through a merchant's website**. With respect to Figures 10 and 11, Greenberg states : "In this embodiment, a merchant doing business over the Internet preferably contracts with an internet telephony service provider to *enable internet telephony* between consumers who visit the merchant's website and the merchant's representatives present at a call center." (Paragraph 0059). In Paragraph 0060, Greenberg goes on to explain the process and

states "[i]ncluded in this downloaded information (step 1110 of Figure 11) is *at least one icon when, when clicked on by the end user, will initiate an internet telephone transaction.*"

The Examiner also states "Greenberg further discloses the actual telephone number of the call center may be included in the icon in addition to or instead of one or more icon fields." Applicant assumes the Examiner is referring to the following sentence in Paragraph 0062: "Furthermore, in certain embodiments, the actual telephone number of the call center may be included in the icon in addition to or instead of one or more icon identification fields." In this sentence, Greenberg is merely stating that the merchant's phone number can be included in hidden form fields in addition to or instead of one of the other IDs', such as MerchantID. This is information used by the internet telephony service to make the call, not information displayed to the end user (see discussion below).

2. *Greenberg does not display a unique ID to a user in a webpage that is used to correlate an independent call with prior use of a website. The merchant ID, link ID, and customer/session IDs referenced in Greenberg are not displayed to users. They are hidden form fields associated with the "icon" a user clicks to make a call from the merchant's website.*

The Examiner appears to equate the "icon" that a user can click on to make a website-initiated call with the unique ID that displayed to the user in the claimed invention. Greenberg states that the icon preferably includes an application server address, a merchant ID, a link ID, and customer/session ID. (Paragraph 0060). However, such IDs are *not* displayed to a user.

Greenberg defines an "icon" as any object, such as a graphical object or a link, on a webpage that may be clicked on by an end user. (Paragraph 0060) Links and graphical objects that can be clicked on are well known in the art. It is common to associate information, such as IDs, with links, buttons, and other clickable objects, but such information is not displayed to the user. If the icon is a link, such information is embedded in the URL. If the icon is a button, then the identification information is in the *hidden* form fields associated with the button. This is supported by the fact that Greenberg refers to the as IDs as "icon identification form fields." (Paragraph 0062). Since the Greenberg method does not involve displaying a unique ID to the user, Greenberg does not disclose any of the steps related to the unique ID recited in claim 1.

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that IDs in the icon identification form fields are displayed to the user (as the Examiner contends), Greenberg still does not disclose using such IDs to correlate a user's user of a website with a subsequent call made independent of the website. This is because Greenberg is not directed at solving such problem.

The Examiner cites Paragraph 0062 as disclosing that the phone call can be made independent of the website. However, this is not what Greenberg discloses in Paragraph 00062. Instead, in such paragraph, Greenberg discloses that not all hidden form fields need be used in all applications. As an example, Greenberg notes that if all calls are directed to the same location regardless of which icon the user clicked, the website developer could leave the link ID field blank when he develops the code for the website, as it is not necessary to differentiate from different icons in routing a user's call.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Greenberg.

Dependent claims 2-7, 14, 15, 17, are 33-34 recite additional elements that further distinguish the invention. However, a discussion of the individual elements is not necessary, as these claims are patentably distinguishable over Greenberg at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 19-22 and 35-36 include the limitations "for each user that accesses the website, transmitting a webpage to the user that visibly displays a unique ID, where the unique ID is unique to the user's web browser and where the unique ID is generated without obtaining information that identifies the user personally" and "correlating such user's call to the customer service agent with user use of the website by correlating records from each of the website and customer service agent call center using the unique IDs." For the same reasons as described with respect to claim 1, Greenberg does not disclose these limitations.

Claims 23-27 and 31 include the limitations "a web server for the website that transmits a web page that visibly displays a unique ID to each user that accesses the website, where, for each user, the unique ID is unique to the user's web browser, and unique ID is generated without obtaining information that identifies the user personally" and "an analyzer that correlates users' calls to a customer service agent, made independent of the website, with users' use of the website by correlating records in the first and second databases associated with matching unique IDs." For the same reasons discussed with respect to claim 1, Greenberg does not disclose these limitations.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-7, 14, 15, 17, 19-27, 31, and 33-36 are patentably distinguishable over Greenberg. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

MARK D. SCHOENHALS

Dated: September 17, 2010 By: Tina M. Lessani

Tina M. Lessani
Lessani & Lessani LLP
163 Cypress Point Road
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
Tel: (650) 712-0420
Fax: (650) 712-0449